JL:Re Anson- In the half-hour I had to wait for my blood test this a.m. I got to read very little more of this Introduction because of fascination with and note-making about the three pages I covered. It is an extremely cunning work about which with each new word I develop more suspicions. They may be without warrant but I'm going to take my time whenever I can and make a fairly complete set of notes. If I can't tell till the back cover whether he is out for more than a buck, the sources of bucks outside Bantam can be conjectured from the doctrine to the point I've reached. Touching all bases (sponsors?) he is glibly irrational and is undetected. For the point I've reached he theorizes (having denounced all others for this sin on Tomorrow) along the line he was utterly unable to develop, as I'd cautioned him 5/2/75. The lack of evidence is irrelevant. I have as yet seen nothing to make this ~~xxfix~~ an anti-CIA book. Repeating the not new is not hurtful. There are several pages that come right from the Epilogue of WW II, even the approach. It is nowhere else in the literature. It is neither credited nor in the bibliography although as I noted earlier it is used at a point where footnotes had to be renumbered, indication of the insertion of one. And keeping the costly changes to one graf. He needs being watched. So do his credited associates. He actual says at one point that Scott had a memo IN the Pentagon Papers. This is to credit Scott with the earlier work of others, too. However, I've little time for reading, which will handicap any analysis.
While we were talking tonight-6:00 to 6:15, approx., National Public Radion had an item of which Lil could get only part. It said that there was new evidence, according to Ray's lawyers. More about this and a new investigation she did not catch. If you were not spoken to I suggest you request a tape of that segment. Might be interesting to know who said what about what. HW 12/22/75